

Appl. No.: 10/644,841  
Reply to Office action of Oct. 9, 2008

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Regarding clauses 1-2 of your examination report, as far as I understand the foreign priority documents can be filed without surcharge until before the issue fee is paid. I will file them on time.
2. Regarding clauses 7-13 of your examination report, I have amended the claims accordingly.
3. Regarding clauses 14-16 of your examination report, I respectfully submit that Kardach (US patent application 2002/0148345) talks in paragraph [0032] about including a timer and a high priority event (interrupt) circuit in the host processor that can enable a real-time kernel to run underneath an operating system that does not have real-time attributes. However he does not say anything about implementing an area or ring below ring 0 which is more privileged than ring 0, and he does not talk about a more privileged area or ring within ring 0 in which a control system and/or security system is adapted to catch exceptions caused by device drivers in ring 0 and/or by the operating system, and in fact he does not even mention ring 0 or rings or privilege levels at all anywhere in the patent. Anyway, I have amended the independent claims to make this distinction even more clear. In addition, I have amended claim 16 to refer now to system claim 1 and similarly claim 28 to refer now to method claim 9 and further clarify the distinction, so claim 16 and 28 now belong to the elected group and should also be examined.
4. Therefore any combination with Gaul (US patent application 2001/0034847) is irrelevant, and since the independent claims should be allowed, the dependent claims should also be allowed anyway since they recite additional patentable matter over the independent claims. In addition Gaul does not talk at all about Copy-on-Write as in claims 86 & 87. In addition, paragraph [0017] in Gaul merely talks about a host-based application which can assess a company's internal network security needs, which can include intrusion detection and

security monitoring. This does not mention in any way any of the specific features of claims 5, 15 & 30. Similarly, for example claims 42-43 deal with enabling at least part of the security system to automatically run on a specific computer even if said computer is booted from at least one of a floppy drive, CD, network drive, and any other source that is not the normal boot area. There is no such feature in Gaul. However, I have amended claim 42 to make this distinction more clear.

5. Regarding clause 17 of your examination report, I respectfully submit that col. 3 line 62 – col.4 line 5 in Nachenberg (US patent 6,357,008) merely talk about emulating a program in a virtual environment to check if it is a virus. These lines do not talk at all for example about the features of claims 20 & 83 (which talk about identifying if the user or an application initiated an activity and acting differently accordingly), or for example about the features of claims 46, 58, 67 or 68, or for example the features of claims 70-71, 77-78, 86 & 90-93 (which talk about Copy-on-Write), or for example the features of claim 72 & 79 (which talk about enabling the user to interact with an integrated view of the desktop and/or of the file system, based on merged views of virtual environments), or for example the features of claims 73-75 & 80-82 (which talk about automatic segregation between programs). Similarly also col. 4 line 66 – col. 5 line 4 in Nachenberg also to not talk about any of the features of claim 46. Regarding claim 64, even though col. 4 lines 25-31 in Nachenberg mention that a virus might create an idle loop, they do not discuss automatic detection and warning the user about misusing resources as in claim 64. In addition, since the independent claims should be allowed, the dependent claims should also be allowed anyway since they recite additional patentable matter over the independent claims.
6. Regarding clause 18 of your examination report, I respectfully submit that col. 1 lines 43-55 in Pitt (US patent 5,675,250) do not cover the features of claim 52, such as that the security system attaches to each message an identification that shows if the OS or another application is the source of the message, and the Security System allows certain messages to be initiated only by the OS. In addition, since the independent claims should be allowed, the dependent claims

should also be allowed anyway since they recite additional patentable matter over the independent claims.

7. Regarding clause 19 of your examination report, I respectfully submit that Togawa (US patent 6,240,530) only talks about saving files in a save data area, but does not mention at all a roll back log as on claim 62.
8. Regarding clause 20 of your examination report, I respectfully submit that Moy (US patent 5,425,102) only talks about normal password protection, which is well known, whereas claim 66 talks about a system in which the hardware of the CPU and/or the hardware of the disk itself does not allow any access to a file unless the software that tries to access it is identified as its rightful owner, which is a very specific feature not mentioned in Moy.
9. In addition, since the independent claims should be allowed, the dependent claims should also be allowed anyway since they recite additional patentable matter over the independent claims.
10. In addition I would like to remind you that the equivalent application with a more or less equivalent set of claims has been already granted in England.

Therefore, in view of the above, I respectfully request that a timely notice of allowance be issued in this case.

However, I would appreciate it very much if you could contact me in advance (for example by phone to 972-2-5665072 or more preferably by email to [yaron@vms.huji.ac.il](mailto:yaron@vms.huji.ac.il)) a few days before issuing the notice of allowance in order to give me a chance to make final adjustments in the claims in case I find something that still needs to be improved. Also, if there are further issues that need clarification I would appreciate it very much if you contact me by email before issuing a further office action. In addition, I still have to submit the IDS for this application, so please wait for the IDS before sending me your next reply.

Respectfully submitted,  
Yaron Mayer

/Yaron Mayer/

*Yaron Mayer*